

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/341,641		SCHMIDT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BJ Forman		1634	

**All Participants:**

 (1) BJ Forman.

 (2) Deborah Yellin.
**Status of Application: Amended**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview: 2 March 2005**
**Time: \_\_\_\_\_**
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

21

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Ms Yellin to discuss possible amendments adding elements to the claims to define the invention as described in Applicant's response. Applicant's response asserts a quantitative relationship exists between a DNA molecule and the mass label cleaved whereby the sequence of the DNA molecules is reconstructed based on the quantitative relationship. This relationship is described in the specification in the section spanning pages 14-15. The examiner stated that the claims, as currently written do not define the inventive relationship, but if amended to clearly define the relationship (as taught in the specification) would overcome the prior art. Ms. Yellin was unable to contact Applicant in a timely manner for approval of any amendments. The examiner stated that a Final Action will be mailed, but amendments clearly defining the quantitative relationship will be considered in an after final amendment. .

  
BJ FORMAN, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER